

March 29, 2007

**CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form
(Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)**

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

P06-069, R06-019, AP 06-004, Log No. 06-20-001

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

3. a. Contact Greg Krzys, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 694-3103
c. E-mail: gregory.krzys@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

The project site lies approximately 45 miles east of the City of San Diego, approximately three miles north of the community of Potrero and State Route 94 in southeast San Diego County at the terminal end of Round Potrero Road (Pans: 602-170-02; 604-050-01; and 604-090-01). The address is 1876 Round Potrero Road. The site is within the Mountain Empire Community Planning area.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates:

Page 1296, Grid L/8; Page 1315, Grid K/9; Page 1316, Grid L/9

5. Project Applicant name and address:

Blackwater West, LLC, P.O. Box 710897, San Diego, CA 92171

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:

Land Use Designation:

Density:

Mountain Empire

(20)-General Agriculture; (23)-National Forest
and State Parks

1 du/40 acre(s)

7. Zoning
- | | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Use Regulation: | A70 |
| Minimum Lot Size: | 40 acre(s) |
| Special Area Regulation: | A |
-
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------|
| Use Regulation: | A72 |
| Minimum Lot Size: | 8 acre(s) |
| Special Area Regulation: | A |

8. Description of project

Major Use Permit

The Blackwater West project proposal is a military and law enforcement training facility to accommodate a total of 360 persons on an approximately 709-acre property. This will include 60 staff members comprised of instructors, support personnel and maintenance workers, and 300 students. The typical student would stay overnight during the week because the standard training course is 5 days in length. The majority of students will arrive on Sunday night and depart Friday evening. The project would include the development of a combination of indoor administrative, facility support, guest service and training building structures, and indoor/outdoor tactical training areas. All development would be located in the southwestern and eastern portions of the site. The northern and western portions of the site would remain as preserved sensitive habitat.

The following facilities are proposed in order to accomplish the project objectives: Administration/ Headquarter Building; Caretaker Residence; Dining Hall Building; Bunkhouse Building; Classroom Building; Armory Building; Tactical Driving Track; EVOC Skid Pad ; Urban Simulation Training Area; Maintenance Building; Carbine Ranges; Pistol Ranges; Live-Fire Tactical Training Area ; Law Enforcement Training Tower; Rescue Safety Training Tower; Ship Simulators; Track Maintenance and Classroom Building; Defensive Tactics Training Area; and Helipad. Existing poultry farming uses would be removed and operations would cease. Existing cattle ranching would remain as an agricultural use.

The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category (1.6) Environmentally Constrained Areas, Land Use Designations (20) – General Agriculture and (23) – National Forest and State Parks. Zoning for the site is A70 and A72. Access would be provided by a private road connecting to Round Potrero Road. The project would be served by on-site septic systems and groundwater. Approximately three (3) new on-site sewage septic systems would be constructed to handle wastewater generated from the project. Water needs would be served from existing and proposed on-site wells. The site is presently serviced by sufficient electrical infrastructure to accommodate the proposed project.

Rezone

The project site is zoned with a special area "A" designator. This designation is called the Agricultural Preserve Area Regulation and is implemented under Zoning Ordinance Section 5100-5110. The proposed rezone will remove the special area designator "A".

Agricultural Permit

The project site is part of a County agricultural preserve. An agricultural permit has been filed to remove the agricultural preserve.

Location

The project site is located at 1876 Round Potrero Road in the Potrero community area within unincorporated San Diego County. The Assessor parcel numbers are: 602-170-02-00; 604-090-01-00; 604-050-01-00.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

There are thirteen parcels contiguous to the project site. All lands surrounding the project site are undeveloped native habitat. Lands are owned and managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to the west, east and south. A private in-holding within the BLM lands to the west is adjacent to the project site. The US Forest Service (FS) owns and manages the land due north. Two private landholdings abut the site to the southeast. In the overall landscape view, the FS owns and manages the land heading east and north of the site. The BLM owns and manages the lands to the west and scattered tracts to the south. Private residential development and agricultural uses occur further south with increasing intensity in proximity to SR 94.

The topography of the project site is a gentle south-southwest sloping valley completely surrounded by mountain foothills. North of the site lies Hauser Canyon through which runs Cottonwood Creek from Lake Moreno to the east towards Barrett Lake to the west. The lands surrounding the site are dominated by chaparral communities intermixed with stands of sage scrub, oak woodlands and riparian-wetland habitats along the stream beds and canyon floor.

On-site, non-native grasslands and chaparral dominate the habitat types. Smaller amounts of oak woodland occur in the northeast and southwest areas and alkali meadow occurs in the area immediately east and south of an existing cattle pond. A series of undefined ephemeral drainages cross the grassland and alkali meadow area feeding into the cattle pond. The pond overflow exits the western side of the site into McAlmond Canyon via an ephemeral drainage tributary to Cottonwood Creek approximately 4 miles to the west below Barrett Lake.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Agricultural Preserve Cancellation	County of San Diego
Major Use Permit	County of San Diego
Rezone	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Groundwater Wells and Exploratory or Test Borings Permit	County of San Diego
Water Well Permit	County of San Diego
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1602 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
Air Quality Permit to Construct	Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Septic Tank Permit	County of San Diego
Water Well Permit	County of San Diego
Fire District Approval	San Diego Rural Fire District

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or a “Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Aesthetics</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Agriculture Resources</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Air Quality</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Biological Resources</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Cultural Resources</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Geology & Soils</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Hazards & Has. Materials</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Hydrology & Water Quality</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Land Use & Planning</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Mineral Resources</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Noise</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Population & Housing</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Public Services</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Recreation</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Transportation/Traffic</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Utilities & Service Systems</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Mandatory Findings of Significance</u> | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature

Greg Krzys
Printed Name

March 29, 2007

Date

Land Use/Environmental Planner
Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued view sheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. Based on a site visit completed by Greg Krzys on August 3, 2006 the proposed project is not located near or visible from a scenic vista and will not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. The project site is located approximately three miles due north of the intersection of SR 94 and Potrero Valley Road. Potrero Valley Road is a second priority scenic route from SR 94 to the Potrero County Park. SR 94 is identified as a third priority scenic route in the project area from I-125 to I-8. The project site is not visible from Potrero Valley Road, SR 94 or any other adjacent scenic vantage point due to a range of low lying mountain foothills that entirely surround the property and project area. This mountain foothill topography creates a valley basin isolated from outside view unless access is onto the site because there is only one access road. Two additional roads leave the site to the north and east. These roads are used for fire district access and utility line access respectively and are not permitted for public access. Federal lands surrounding the project may result in public use with access to the project view shed. However, except for the access roads entering and exiting the site as described above, there are no other access points to the area surrounding the site. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated. A scenic highway is officially designated as a State scenic highway when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to the California Department of Transportation for scenic highway approval, and receives notification from Caltrans that the highway has been designated as an official Scenic Highway. Based on a site visit completed by Greg Krzys on August 3, 2006, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the same composite viewshed of a

State scenic highway and will not change the visual composition of an existing scenic resource within a State scenic highway. Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The project site is located approximately three miles due north of the intersection of SR 94 and Potrero Valley Road. SR 94 is identified as a third priority scenic route from I-125 to I-8. The project site is not visible from the SR 94 or any other adjacent scenic vantage point along SR 94 due to a range of low lying mountain foothills that entirely surround the property and project area. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: Because the project site is only visible from vantage points on the ridgeline surrounding the valley, project development will not impact or degrade the surrounding area's visual character. On-site project development will result in grading and earthwork to improve or construct roads, building pads, shooting ranges and a driving track. This work will be largely located within the impact footprint of the existing facilities except for specific areas such as the proposed administration building, two residences and part of the driving track. The current projection is that degradation of the on-site visual character will be less than significant and may or may not require mitigation. However, before a final determination is complete, a preliminary grading plan has been requested to assess the amount and quantity of earthwork required to develop the project. The preliminary grading plan, building type and height, and project plot plan will be used to determine if an impact is present and/or requires mitigation. This issue will also be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code. However, it will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115), including the Zone B lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights.

In addition, the proposed project will control outdoor lighting and sources of glare in the following ways:

1. The project will not install outdoor lighting that directly illuminates neighboring properties.
2. The project will not install outdoor lighting that would cast a direct beam angle towards a potential observer, such as a motorists, cyclist or pedestrian.
3. The project will not install outdoor lighting for vertical surfaces such as buildings, landscaping, or signs in a manner that would result in useful light or spill light being cast beyond the boundaries of intended area to be lit.
4. The project will not install any highly reflective surfaces such as glare-producing glass or high-gloss surface color that will be visible along roadways, pedestrian walkways, or in the line of sight of adjacent properties.

The project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level

In addition, the project's outdoor lighting is controlled through the Major Use Permit, which further limits outdoor lighting through strict controls. Therefore, compliance with the Code, in combination with the outdoor lighting and glare controls listed above ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES -- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by

the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site has land designated as prime farmlands. As a result, the proposed project was reviewed by the Department of Planning and Land Use's agricultural specialist and was determined not to have significant adverse project or cumulative level impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use for the following reasons: cattle grazing and poultry egg production occur on-site. The project proposal would remove the poultry operation but maintain and expand the number of cattle grazing on-site. The grazing land is within the area mapped as prime farmlands. These grazing lands would continue to function as an on-going agricultural use. Therefore, the proposed project will not convert prime farmlands to a non-agricultural use and no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The site is zoned A70 and A72, Limited Agriculture and General Agriculture. The A70 Use Regulations are intended to create and preserve primarily agricultural crop production. The A72 Use Regulations are intended to create and preserve areas for raising crops and animals. The A70 and A72 Use Regulations require a major use permit for commercial and/or civic use types. In addition, the site has a special area "A" designator. This denotes that land is a County agricultural preserve. The agricultural preserve designation was applied in the early 1970s over large areas of the County. The agricultural preserve designation does not place any

limits or restrictions on the types of uses that may occur on a property. The preserve designation was created and overlaid on the properties to aid owners in placing their land into a Williamson Act contracts.

The proposed project is a military and law enforcement training facility. In addition, a rezone and agricultural permit have been submitted to remove the special area "A" designator and agricultural preserve. The proposed projects will not conflict with the existing agricultural zoning because the proposed uses are permitted in the A70 and A72 zones, and although the proposed use will remove the poultry operation, it will also result in the expansion of cattle grazing on-site for maintenance of the grasslands for raptor foraging and possibly as expanded beef production. The project will also not conflict with a Williamson Act Contract because the site is not in a contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: The project site has a portion of land in the central to south central area designated as prime farmland. This area is consistent with the current cattle grazing land. The site also supports an active poultry operation. These poultry buildings are not mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance. The poultry is also not recorded by the County Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures as an agricultural commodity.

The proposed project will remove the poultry operation. Cattle grazing would be retained on approximately 294 acres of the site. The number of cattle may be increased to effectively manage the grasslands for raptor foraging and may be used in beef production. The current projection is that project development on approximately 300 acres will not change the existing on-site condition and convert farmland to a non-agricultural use because: the prime farmland and additional cattle grazing areas will be maintained and expanded on-site, and the project will be conditioned to remediate the site if the proposed use end. Remediation would allow for continued or expanded agricultural use.

The potential agricultural impacts are anticipated to be a less than significant impact. However, the entirety of this issue will be addressed through completion of a LARA model to rate the on-site agricultural resources and determine what, if any, impacts

occur. This issue including cumulative impacts will also be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: An air quality analysis has been requested to address potential air quality issues during the construction phase and operational phase of the project. Specific operational issues will include the driving track and shooting ranges. This issue will also be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: An air quality analysis has been requested to address potential air quality issues during the construction phase and operational phase of the project. Specific operational issues will include the driving track and shooting ranges. This issue will also be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: An air quality analysis has been requested to address potential air quality issues during the construction phase and operational phase of the project. Specific operational issues will include the driving track and shooting ranges. This issue will also be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality.

No Impact: Based a site visit conducted by Greg Krzys on August 3, 2006, sensitive receptors have not been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project. Furthermore, no point-source emissions of air pollutants (other than vehicle emissions) are associated with the project. As such, the project will not expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. As such, no impact from odors is anticipated.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project applicant has prepared a biological resources report detailing the on-site habitats and observed species. Additional surveys are still required for spring plant species and several sensitive and/or listed species. The current mapped habitats include: granitic northern mixed chaparral (290.7 acres), southern coast live oak riparian forest (2.3 acres), open coast live oak woodland (13.8 acres), open Engelmann oak woodland (3.1 acres), non-native grassland (355.7 acres), alkali meadow (56.7 acres), disturbed wetland (2.1 acres), open water (1.1 acres), and urban/developed areas (64.9 acres).

Sensitive plant species detected on site to date include one County Group A species (Tecate tarplant), one County Group B species (sticky gerardia), and two County Group D species (rush chaparral-star and Engelmann oak). These species are found in relatively low numbers on site with the exception of Tecate tarplant. Sensitive wildlife species detected on site include turkey vulture, white-tailed kite, golden eagle, loggerhead shrike, and Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow, each of which is a County Group I species. Three pairs of golden eagles are known to nest within five miles of the project site, one of which nests in Hauser Canyon within one half mile to the north. Other rare plants and County Group I and II wildlife species have potential to occur on-site. Additional rare plant surveys will be conducted during the spring of 2007 to determine whether other rare plants occur on-site.

Project level and cumulative impacts to sensitive and/or listed plant and animal species will be addressed through the biological resources report and the Environmental Impact Report.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: The project applicant has prepared a biological resources report detailing the on-site habitats and observed species. Additional surveys are still required for spring plant species and several sensitive and/or listed species. The current mapped habitats include: granitic northern mixed chaparral (290.7 acres), southern coast live oak riparian forest (2.3 acres), open coast live oak woodland (13.8 acres), open Engelmann oak woodland (3.1 acres), non-native grassland (355.7 acres), alkali meadow (56.7 acres), disturbed wetland (2.1 acres), open water (1.1 acres), and urban/developed areas (64.9 acres).

Project development may include the following on- and off-site, direct and indirect impacts: grading and construction consist of 1.8 acres of granitic northern mixed chaparral (1.6 on-site, 0.2 off-site), 0.3 acres of open coast live oak woodland on-site, 116.0 acres of non-native grassland on site and 38.2 acres of urban/developed areas (37.9 on-site, 0.3 off-site); creation and maintenance of the fuel modification zones consists of 12.2 acres of granitic northern mixed chaparral (11.3 on-site, 0.9 off-site), 0.5 acres of open coast live oak woodland on site, 42.9 acres of non-native grassland (42.8 on-site and 0.1 off-site) and 16.3 acres of urban/developed areas (16.1 on-site and 0.2 off-site); and indirect impacts from increased noise associated with operation of the firing ranges would affect wildlife use within a total of 172.1 acres consisting of 31.4 acres on-site and 140.7 acres off-site. Elevated daytime noise during training would impact 163.9 acres of granitic northern mixed chaparral (23.2 acres on-site, 140.7 acres off-site) and 2.7 acres of non-native grassland on-site.

Project impacts are proposed to be mitigated through on-site, in-kind preservation within a biological open space easement. The easement will cover approximately 560 acres of habitats including: granitic northern mixed chaparral (277.8 acres); southern coast live oak riparian forest (2.3 acres); open coast live oak woodland (13 acres); open engelmann oak woodland (3.1 acres); non-native grasslands (196.9 acres); alkali meadow (56.7 acres); disturbed wetland (2.1 acres); open water (1.1 acres); and developed (10.9 acres). Therefore, habitat impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level.

The aforementioned acreages in the above two paragraphs are not finalized and are considered approximates until the biological resources report is accepted as complete. The proposed impacts are anticipated to be mitigated to a less than significant impact. However, the entirety of this issue including cumulative impacts will be addressed in both the biological resources report and Environmental Impact Report.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: The project site contains federally protected wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act that include alkali meadow, open water and disturbed wetland habitat(s). Impacts to jurisdictional wetlands/waters are not anticipated with the current project, which has been designed to preclude impacts to wetlands and other jurisdictional waters. A total of 1.6 acres of alkali meadow, which would be considered an RPO wetland, would be

within the brush management zone. Because this vegetation type consists of low-growing, water-dependent plants, active clearing of these areas would not be required.

Wetlands defined under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act contained on the project site are proposed for protection in a biological open space easement. No discharging into, directly removing, or hydrologically interrupting any federally protected wetlands will occur. Therefore, all impacts will be avoided because federally protected wetlands will be placed in a biological open space or conservation easement with the appropriate wetland buffer and no significant impacts will occur to federally protected wetlands on the project site.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: The project applicant has prepared a biological resources report detailing the on-site habitats and observed species. Additional surveys are still required for spring plant species and several sensitive and/or listed species. The current mapped habitats include: granitic northern mixed chaparral (290.7 acres), southern coast live oak riparian forest (2.3 acres), open coast live oak woodland (13.8 acres), open Engelmann oak woodland (3.1 acres), non-native grassland (355.7 acres), alkali meadow (56.7 acres), disturbed wetland (2.1 acres), open water (1.1 acres), and urban/developed areas (64.9 acres).

Development of the site could result in the direct loss of 174.9 acres of native and naturalized vegetation communities, and indirect impacts to 166.6 acres of habitat on- and off-site. The proposed open space will cover approximately 560 acres of habitats including: granitic northern mixed chaparral (277.8 acres); southern coast live oak riparian forest (2.3 acres); open coast live oak woodland (13 acres); open engelmann oak woodland (3.1 acres); non-native grasslands (196.9 acres); alkali meadow (56.7 acres); disturbed wetland (2.1 acres); open water (1.1 acres); and developed (10.9 acres).

The proposed project is being designed to reduce potential impacts to species movement by minimizing encroachment into the large grassland area and retaining the entire northern and western portions of the site for open space. Facilities in the southern portion of the site were designed to maintain a minimum 650-ft corridor that connects the natural north-facing slope in the southern portion of the site to the grassland and wet meadow area to the north. The site plan was also designed to maintain a minimum 1,000-ft grassland/meadow corridor in the northern portion of the site.

The aforementioned acreages in the above paragraphs are not finalized and are considered approximates until the biological resources report is accepted as complete. The proposed impacts are anticipated to be mitigated to a less than significant impact. However, the entirety of this issue including cumulative impacts will be addressed in both the biological resources report and Environmental Impact Report.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: The project site is not part of or located within a planning area for a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. The project is subject to state's CEQA and the County's Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO).

The project applicant has prepared a biological resources report detailing the on-site habitats and observed species. Additional surveys are still required for spring plant species and several sensitive and/or listed species. The current mapped habitats include: granitic northern mixed chaparral (290.7 acres), southern coast live oak riparian forest (2.3 acres), open coast live oak woodland (13.8 acres), open Engelmann oak woodland (3.1 acres), non-native grassland (355.7 acres), alkali meadow (56.7 acres), disturbed wetland (2.1 acres), open water (1.1 acres), and urban/developed areas (64.9 acres).

Project development may include the following on- and off-site, direct and indirect impacts: grading and construction consist of 1.8 acres of granitic northern mixed chaparral (1.6 on-site, 0.2 off-site), 0.3 acres of open coast live oak woodland on-site, 116.0 acres of non-native grassland on-site and 38.2 acres of urban/developed areas (37.9 on-site, 0.3 off-site); creation and maintenance of the fuel modification consist of 12.2 acres of granitic northern mixed chaparral (11.3 on-site, 0.9 off-site), 0.5 acres of open coast live oak woodland on site, 42.9 acres of non-native grassland (42.8 on-site and 0.1 off-site) and 16.3 acres of urban/developed areas (16.1 on-site and 0.2 off-site); and indirect impacts from increased noise associated with operation of the firing ranges would affect wildlife use within a total of 172.1 acres consisting of 31.4 acres on-site and 140.7 acres off-site. Elevated daytime noise during training would impact 163.9 acres of granitic northern mixed chaparral (23.2 acres on-site, 140.7 acres off-site) and 2.7 acres of non-native grassland on-site.

Project impacts are proposed to be mitigated through onsite, in-kind preservation within a biological open space easement. The easement will cover approximately 560 acres of habitats including: granitic northern mixed chaparral (277.8 acres); southern coast live oak riparian forest (2.3 acres); open coast live oak woodland (13 acres); open engelmann oak woodland (3.1 acres); non-native grasslands (196.9 acres); alkali meadow (56.7 acres); disturbed wetland (2.1 acres); open water (1.1 acres); and developed (10.9 acres). Therefore, habitat impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level.

The aforementioned acreages in the above two paragraphs are not finalized and are considered approximates until the biological resources report is accepted as complete. The proposed impacts are anticipated to be mitigated to a less than significant impact. Therefore, the project will be in compliance with local, state and federal regulations. However, the entirety of this issue including cumulative impacts will be addressed in both the biological resources report and Environmental Impact Report.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: There is a historic site consisting of a ranch building complex. Portions of the ranch complex are believed to date to the early first half of the 20th century. Renovations and remodels have occurred to several structures and others are in a significant state of degradation. The preliminary assessment is that no proposed project impacts will result in a potentially significant impact that cannot be mitigated to less than significant. Impacts and mitigation analysis will be documented in the Cultural Resources Technical Report and the Environmental Impact Report.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: Twenty-one new cultural sites and four isolates have been surveyed on-site. All but one of the sites and isolates are prehistoric resources. It is anticipated that 10 prehistoric sites will be included within biological open space and no further testing of these sites are required. Nine remaining sites were then analyzed in a Phase I testing program that included shovel test pits (STPs) to determine possible subsurface deposits, and detailed mapping and photography. Because of the presence of subsurface deposits, and because of direct project impacts, Phase II testing was implemented on five sites to determine the degree of significance. Phase II testing and evaluation is nearing completion on those sites identified as potentially significant. Phase I and II testing has been coordinated with the Native American Heritage Commission and a Native American representative has been on site for most of the testing. A record and document search found that previous surveys conducted in 1980 for a SDGE transmission line identified three prehistoric sites on the property. Ten other cultural resource sites have been previously recorded within a one-mile radius of the project property. The majority of these 10 sites have been found along Cottonwood Creek and several others along McAlmond Canyon.

Impacts and mitigation analysis will be documented in the Cultural Resources Technical Report and the Environmental Impact Report. Grading monitoring will be conditioned on the project to reduce any potential issues to less than significant. Impacts and mitigation analysis will be documented in the Cultural Resources Technical Report and the Environmental Impact Report.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Unique Paleontological Resources - A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History, combined with available data on San Diego County's geologic formations, indicates that the project is located on geological formations that have marginal resource potential over the central and south central portions of the site. The remaining areas of the site are located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and have no potential for producing fossil remains. Marginal resource potential is assigned to geologic formations that are composed either of volcanic rocks or high-grade metasedimentary rocks, and have only limited probability for producing fossil remains from certain sedimentary lithologies at localized outcrops. Due to site's limited potential to support any fossil remains, the project will not result in the loss of significant paleontological information. Therefore, the project will not result in the permanent loss of significant paleontological information. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable loss of information,

because all projects that exceed a cut depth of 10 feet and will disturb the unweathered bedrock in the areas with high or moderate resource potential are required to have a paleontological monitor present during grading operations.

Unique Geologic Features – The site does contain any unique geologic features that have been catalogued within the Conservation Element (Part X) of the County's General Plan or support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: The preliminary assessment is that the area around Cottonwood Creek may have been the site of Kumeyaay village. The project site may have supported several Kumeyaay households at various times throughout the year. Therefore, there is the potential for human remains. However, Phase I and II testing on-site has not resulted in any evidence to support this conclusion and the location(s) of the cultural sites and isolates would indicate that any potential remains would be located within the proposed open space. Therefore, no proposed development would result in a potentially significant impact. Grading monitoring may be conditioned on the project to reduce any potential issues to less than significant. Impacts and mitigation analysis will be documented in the Cultural Resources Technical Report and the Environmental Impact Report.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?
Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located within a fault-rupture hazard zone as identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42 (SP 42), Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California or within an area with substantial evidence of a known fault. However, a site specific Geotechnical Report prepared by Ninyo & Moore, on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use as Environmental Review Number 06-20-001, has determined that the project lies outside of any fault-rupture hazard zone. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to a known zone of fault rupture hazard as a result of this project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The Elsinore fault has been mapped approximately 30 miles to the east of the site. A site specific Geotechnical Report prepared by Ninyo & Moore, on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use as Environmental Review Number 06-20-001, recommends conditioning the project to require development specific subsurface geotechnical evaluations prior to the design and construction of any structures or improvements. This will be made a condition of the project. In addition, to ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements -- Chapter 16 Section 162- Earthquake Design as outlined within the California Building Code. Section 162 requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved by a County Structural Engineer before the issuance of a building or grading permit. Therefore, with implementation of measures outlined in the Geotechnical Report, potentially significant impacts from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking as a result of this project would be reduced to less than significant.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: A site specific Geotechnical Report prepared by Ninyo & Moore, on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use as Environmental Review Number 06-20-001, has determined that the site has

potential for liquefaction because of the underlying loose granular soils, non-plastic silts and relatively shallow groundwater table. The project will be conditioned to complete a development specific subsurface geotechnical evaluation prior to the design and construction of any structures or improvements. Each structure or improvement may require a different approach such as removal of the loose alluvial soils beneath structures to be replaced with compacted fill or locate the building on deep foundations extending through the alluvial soils. The recommended measures in the development specific geotechnical study will be required prior to issuance of building or grading permits. With implementation of measures outlined in the development specific geotechnical study, potentially significant impacts from seismic related ground failure would be reduced to less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: A site specific Geotechnical Report prepared by Ninyo & Moore, on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use as Environmental Review Number 06-20-001, indicates that the site is not within a landslide susceptible zone.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Acid igneous rock, Cienega very rocky coarse sandy loam, Ramona sandy loam, Visalia sandy loam, Cienega-Fallbrook rocky sandy loam, Chino fine sandy loam, La Posta rocky loamy coarse sand and Mottsville loamy coarse sand that has a soil erodibility rating of "moderate" and/or "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.

- The project has prepared a Storm water Management Plan. This document is has not been accepted and requires revisions. However, Source Control and Treatment Control Best Management Practices have been proposed to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site. These will be identified in the environmental documents once the Storm water Management Plan is accepted.
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project will result in site disturbance and grading. However, a site specific Geotechnical Report prepared by Ninyo & Moore, on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use as Environmental Review Number 06-20-001, has reviewed the project and determined that the site is not susceptible to landslide conditions. However, the site has potential lateral spreading, and liquefaction issues related to proximity to the Elsinore fault approximately 30 miles to the east and loose granular soils and high groundwater table. The project will be conditioned to complete a development specific subsurface geotechnical evaluation prior to the design and construction of any structures or improvements. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are Acid igneous rock, Cienega very rocky coarse sandy loam, Ramona sandy loam, Visalia sandy loam, Cienega-Fallbrook rocky sandy loam, Chino fine sandy loam, La Posta rocky loamy coarse sand and Mottsville loamy coarse sand. However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH is currently reviewing the project's

OSWS but has determined that the project is soils capable of supporting OSWS's. Therefore, the project has soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems as determined by the authorized, local public agency. In addition, the project will comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Div. 8, Chap. 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☒ Potentially Significant Unless
Mitigation Incorporation

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: The project proposes a military and law enforcement training facility. Two features of the project will be shooting ranges and a driving track. These two project elements will involve the routine use, storage and transportation of hazardous materials including ammunition, fuel and oil. The nature of the project could result in the deposition of hazardous materials at the site in the form of lead or other substances related to the military and law enforcement training operations. Should the project applicant propose to cease activities and operations associated with the Blackwater West Training Facility, the project applicant will need to remediate any onsite contamination resulting from proposed training activities at the site, including but not limited to, removal of aerial deposited lead and metals associated with munitions training. Remediation of the project site would be to the satisfaction of the Department of Environmental Health, Site Assessment and Mitigation program and this requirement would become a condition of the project MUP. Therefore, mitigation would be required to reduce the significance of potential hazards to the public from the onsite use of hazardous materials.

In addition, significant hazards are not expected from the proposed ongoing site activities that may include storage, handling, transport, emission and disposal of hazardous substances because all onsite activities involving hazardous substances will be in full compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations. California Government Code § 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Section 25500-25520.

The San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division (DEH HMD) is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the CUPA, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks,

and risk management plans. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of on-site. The plan also contains an emergency response plan which describes the procedures for mitigating a hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local Fire Agency having jurisdiction. Implementation of the emergency response plan facilitates rapid response in the event of an accidental spill or release, thereby reducing potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the DEH HMD is required to conduct ongoing routine inspections to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations; to identify safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental spill or release; and to suggest preventative measures to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous substances.

Therefore, due to the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above and the fact that the initial planning, ongoing monitoring, and inspections will occur in compliance with local, State, and Federal regulation; the project will not result in any potentially significant impacts related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous substances.

- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a military and law enforcement training facility. Two features of the project will be shooting ranges and a driving track. These two project elements will involve the routine use, storage and transportation of hazardous materials including ammunition, fuel and oil. However, the project will not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment because all storage, handling, transport, emission and disposal of hazardous substances will be in full compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations. California Government Code § 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Section 25500-25520.

The San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division (DEH HMD) is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the

CUPA, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk management plans. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of on-site. The plan also contains an emergency response plan which describes the procedures for mitigating a hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local Fire Agency having jurisdiction. Implementation of the emergency response plan facilitates rapid response in the event of an accidental spill or release, thereby reducing potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the DEH HMD is required to conduct ongoing routine inspections to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations; to identify safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental spill or release; and to suggest preventative measures to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous substances.

Therefore, due to the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above and the fact that the initial planning, ongoing monitoring, and inspections will occur in compliance with local, State, and Federal regulation; the project will not result in any potentially significant impacts related to the accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. However, a Phase I environmental site assessment (ESA) was completed by Ninyo & Moore, dated November 1, 2006. The report concludes that the past agricultural use included the on-site disposal of animal wastes, farm machinery and equipment maintenance, and storage of pesticides (rodenticide).

The Phase I ESA indicates that no on-site conditions would pose a potentially significant impact that cannot be mitigated to less than significant. A Phase II testing program is currently in progress. If remediation is recommended, this will be made a condition of the project. Impacts and mitigation analysis will be documented in the Phase I and II ESA and the Environmental Impact Report.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports; or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop specific operational area of San Diego County. It provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is located outside a dam inundation zone.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County and Appendix II-A, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the building permit process.

A Fire Service Availability Letter has been received from the Rural Fire Protection District. The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be 10 minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the County Public Facilities Element is 20 minutes. The Rural FPD and the County fire marshals have also reviewed a Fire Protection Plan (FPP) prepared by Hunt Research Corporation dated November 9, 2006. The FPP has been accepted pending revisions required by both the fire district and County fire marshal. The FPP recommends the following measures: 100-300 foot fuel management zones with a 400 foot zone around the administration building; 180,000 gallon water storage tank; fire hydrants; trained on-site fire brigade and fire apparatus; staging area for local and state fire services for a base camp during local fires; emergency helipad; building sprinklers. These recommendations are not inclusive of the entire report's content.

The FPP will be revised per the Rural FPD and County Fire Marshal comments. All mitigation or project design features recommended in the FPP and by the reviewing entities will be conditioned on the project. Therefore, based on the review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code and Appendix II-A and through compliance with the Rural Fire Protection District's conditions, it is not

anticipated that the project will expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires.

Impacts and mitigation analysis will be documented in Fire Protection Plan, Rural FPD conditions and the Environmental Impact Report.

- i) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project will retain an existing stock pond on the western-central property line at the head of McAlmond Canyon and cattle grazing. The poultry operation estimate at 7,000+ chickens currently will be removed. The cattle, poultry and stock pond have been present on-site since the early first half of the 20th century. The proposed project and retention of the pond and cattle grazing is not expected to change the preexisting vector issue or raise a potentially significant issue. Removal of the existing poultry operation may actually reduce overall vector issues because it would eliminate a significant source of animal waste.

Both the stock pond and cattle grazing will become facets of the biological open space and will be managed through a Resource Management Plan (RMP). Vector control will be a part of the RMP. The RMP will be an attachment to the Biological Resources Report when completed because the primary RMP component is for preservation and management of biological resources. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies or create a cumulatively considerable impact because all vector producing uses on-site are preexisting conditions and will reduced in scope and scale with the removal of the poultry operation, and vector control will be a part of an overall comprehensive RMP.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

- a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a law enforcement and military training facility. Project development will require a NPDES permit for discharges of storm water associated with construction activities. Project development may also impact federal ACOE jurisdictional features and require Section 401 certification from the RWQCB and a 404 permit from the ACOE. The project will be conditioned to provide evidence that these permits have been obtained or are not required from applicable agency.

The project will also be required to implement the site design measures, source control BMPs and treatment control BMPs as identified in a Stormwater Management Plan to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. The site design, source control and treatment control BMP measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

Finally, the project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the project will conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and SUSMP, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges. This issue will be addressed in the Stormwater Management Plan and Environmental Impact Report.

- b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies in the 911.24 hydrologic subarea, within the Tijuana hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, portions of this watershed are impaired. The Tijuana River is impaired for eutrophication, coliform bacteria, organic enrichment/low dissolved oxygen, pesticides, solids, synthetic organics, trace elements, and trash; Tijuana River Estuary is impaired for eutrophication, coliform bacteria, lead, nickel, pesticides, thallium, trash; and the Pacific Ocean at the Tijuana River mouth is impaired for coliform bacteria. Constituents

of concern in the Tijuana River watershed include: Freshwater: coliform bacteria, nutrients, trace metals, pesticides, miscellaneous toxics, low dissolved oxygen, and trash; Groundwater: total dissolved solids, nitrates, petroleum, MTBE, and solvents.

The project proposes activities that are associated with these pollutants. However, the site design measures, source control BMPs and treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters.

The site design, source control and treatment control BMPs will be consistent with the regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what Dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Storm water Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed. This issue will be addressed in the Stormwater Management Plan and Environmental Impact Report.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the 911.24 hydrologic subarea, within the Tijuana hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; freshwater replenishment; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; commercial and sport fishing; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; shellfish harvesting; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes potential sources of polluted runoff. However, the site design measures, source control BMPs and treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses.

In addition, the site design, source control and treatment control BMPs will be consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section VIII., Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process. This issue will be addressed in the Stormwater Management Plan and Environmental Impact Report.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: A Groundwater study will be completed to assess existing groundwater resources, project demand, and potential impacts and mitigation. This issue will be addressed through this study and in the Environmental Impact Report.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a law enforcement and military training facility . A Storm water Management Plan (SWMP) dated November 1, 2006 and prepared by Nasland Engineering has been reviewed and revisions requested. The project will be required to implement site design measures, source control, and treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP will specify and describe the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, there are no impacts anticipated that would significantly increase erosion or sedimentation potential or alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b. This issue will be addressed in the Stormwater Management Plan and Environmental Impact Report.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is not anticipated to significantly alter established drainage patterns. Drainage will still be conveyed across and around the site through the existing stock pond on west central property line at the head of McAlmond Canyon. A Preliminary Drainage-Hydrology Study dated November 1, 2006 and prepared by Nasland Engineering has been reviewed by the County DPW and revisions have been requested. The study indicates that post-construction run-off in a 25 year event will increase by 102 cubic feet per second without any site design, source control or treatment control BMPs. This figure is an approximate increase and has not been accepted as factual until the report is completed and accepted by the County DPW. However, detention-retention basins are proposed to detain and treat the stormwater run-off on-site prior to entering the stock pond and McAlmond Canyon off-site. These basins are anticipated to reduce the increase in flow rate and therefore, the project is not expected to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Moreover, the project is anticipated to not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will not substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above. This issue will be addressed in the Drainage-Hydrology Study and Environmental Impact Report.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: A Preliminary Drainage-Hydrology Study dated November 1, 2006 and prepared by Nasland Engineering has been reviewed by the County DPW and revisions have been requested. The initial study indicates that post-construction run-off in a 25 year event will increase by 102 cubic feet per second without any site design, source control or treatment control BMPs. This figure is an approximate increase and has not been accepted as factual until the report is completed and accepted by the County DPW. However, detention-retention basins are proposed to detain and treat the stormwater run-off on-site prior to entering the stock

pond and McAlmond Canyon off-site. These basins will be developed to a capacity to handle peak flow events to reduce the increase in flow rate and therefore, the project is anticipated to not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of planned storm water drainage system. This issue will be addressed in the Drainage-Hydrology Study and Environmental Impact Report.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes potential sources of polluted runoff. However, the site design measures, source control BMPs and treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable. Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information. This issue will be addressed in the Stormwater Management Plan, Drainage-Hydrology Study and Environmental Impact Report.

i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: Drainage swales, which are mapped on a FEMA floodplain map, a County Floodplain Map or have a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site. A Preliminary Drainage-Hydrology Study dated November 1, 2006 and prepared by Nasland Engineering has been reviewed by the County DPW and revisions have been requested. The study currently indicates that proposed residential structures will be located outside the limits of inundation by placement location or construction of building pads that are higher than the inundation depth by a minimum of 2 feet. Therefore, the project will not place housing within a 100-year floodplain area. This issue will be addressed in the Drainage-Hydrology Study and Environmental Impact Report.

j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The project site contains drainage swales, which are identified as being 100-year flood hazard areas. A Preliminary Drainage-Hydrology Study dated November 1, 2006 and prepared by Nasland Engineering has been reviewed by the County DPW and revisions have been requested. The study currently indicates that proposed structures will be located outside the limits of inundation by placement location except for the Administration building. Building pad construction for the admin building would be proposed at a minimum of 2 feet higher than the inundation depth. This construction is not anticipated to impede or redirect flow. Therefore, the project will not place structures within a 100-year floodplain area which would impede or redirect flood flows. This issue will be addressed in the Drainage-Hydrology Study and Environmental Impact Report.

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area including a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

- l) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

- i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. A site specific Geotechnical Report prepared by Ninyo & Moore, on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use as Environmental Review Number 06-20-001, indicates that the site is not within a landslide susceptible zone. In addition, though the project does propose land disturbance that will expose unprotected soils, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose introducing new infrastructure such as major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element (RLUE) Policy 1.6 – Environmentally Constrained Areas (ECA). Through environmental review and implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, this RLUE allows uses and densities as permitted by the Zoning Ordinance, Community and Subregional Plan, and Groundwater Policy (now codified in an ordinance). The

resource responsible for the ECA designation is the underlying County Agricultural Preserve. However, additional biological resources such as foraging habitat for Golden Eagles located in Hauser Canyon may also apply.

The project site is subject to two General Plan Land Use Designations (20) General Agriculture and (23) National Forest and State Parks. The (20) General Agriculture designation is "applied to areas where agricultural use is encouraged, protected and facilitated". Other uses supportive of and/or compatible with agriculture are also permitted. The (23) National Forest and State parks designation subsection (b) applies to this project. This designation is for those private land-holdings lying within the boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest and outside of Country-Town.

The property is zoned A72 which permits the proposed project as a Major Impact Service and Utility through issuance of a Major Use Permit pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 2725.

Additional information has been requested in multiple technical reports that the County will use to determine if the project is consistent with the General Plan RLUE, General Plan Designations, Zoning Ordinance and Mountain Empire Subregional Plan.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: A Geotechnical Reconnaissance report dated November 1, 2006 prepared by Ninyo & Moore has been accepted by the County DPLU as complete. This study is based on geotechnical reference data, field site reconnaissance, and data analysis. The project site's geologic information indicates no significant mineral deposits are present. The site has no mineral resource zone classification. Also, the project site is not located within a region where geologic information indicates significant mineral deposits are present as identified on the County of San Diego's Mineral Resources Map prepared by the County of San Diego. Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant mineral deposits, loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned A70 and A72, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000).

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes development of shooting ranges, tactical simulation environments, driving track, building facilities and emergency helipad that may all increase noise levels on-site. A noise study has been requested to address construction and operational noise. This issue will also be addressed in the Environmental Impact report

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Initial project construction and the development of a driving track may result in groundborne vibrations. A noise study has been requested and will cover groundborne vibrations. This issue will also be addressed in the Environmental Impact report

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes development of shooting ranges, tactical simulation environments, driving track, building facilities and emergency helipad that may all increase noise levels on-site. A noise study has been requested to address construction and operational noise. This issue will also be addressed in the Environmental Impact report

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes development of shooting ranges, tactical simulation environments, driving track, building facilities and emergency helipad that may all increase noise levels on-site. A noise study has been requested to address construction and operational noise. This issue will also be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The property currently has an uninhabited residence that will be removed. Project development will remove an existing, uninhabited residence and construct two other on-site residences. This development will result in a net increase of one single-family residence.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The property currently has an uninhabited residence that will be removed. Project development will remove an existing, uninhabited residence and construct two other on-site residences. This development will result in a net increase of one single family residence. Therefore, the proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Rural Fire Protection District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment

because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XIV. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is commercial use to develop a law enforcement and military training facility. Project development will include the removal of an existing single-family residence and construction of two single-family residences on-site. The proposed commercial use will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity. The two residences will also not represent an increase in use because one residence will be for temporary occupation on as needed basis for visitors, staff, etc, and the other residence represents a replacement of the current residential structure.

In addition, there is an existing surplus of County Regional Parks. Currently, there are over 21,765 acres of regional parkland owned by the County, which far exceeds the General Plan standard of 15 acres per 1,000 population. In addition, there are over one million acres of publicly owned land in San Diego County dedicated to parks or open space including Federal lands, State Parks, special districts, and regional river parks. Due to the extensive surplus of existing publicly owned lands that can be used for recreation the project will not result in substantial physical deterioration of regional recreational facilities or accelerate the deterioration of regional parkland. Moreover, the project will not result any cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated deterioration of regional recreation facilities because even with all past, present and future residential projects a significant surplus of regional recreational facilities will remain.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project has a current estimate of 90 average daily trips based on a maximum occupancy of 360 people on-site per day. The majority of trips will be generated on Sunday and Friday afternoons when the attendees arrive and depart for the 5-day training courses. Initial trip distribution is estimated at 80% to/from the west along SR 94 and 20% to/from the east. A traffic study shall be completed to assess potential direct and indirect traffic impacts and safety issues. Traffic issues will also be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project has a current estimate of 90 average daily trips based on a maximum occupancy of 360 people on-site per day. The majority of trips will be generated on Sunday and Friday afternoons when the attendees arrive and depart for the 5-day training courses. Initial trip distribution is estimated at 80% to/from the west along SR 94 and 20% to/from the east. A traffic study shall be completed to assess potential direct and indirect traffic impacts and safety issues. Traffic issues will also be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project has a current estimate of 90 average daily trips based on a maximum occupancy of 360 people on-site per day. The majority of trips will be generated on Sunday and Friday afternoons when the attendees arrive and depart for the 5-day training courses. Initial trip distribution is estimated at 80% to/from the west along SR 94 and 20% to/from the east. A traffic study shall be completed to assess potential direct and indirect traffic impacts and safety issues. Traffic issues will also be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The Rural FPD and the County fire marshals have also reviewed a Fire Protection Plan (FPP) prepared by Hunt Research Corporation dated November 9, 2006. The FPP has been accepted pending revisions required by both the fire district and County fire marshal. Round Potrero Road has been determined as adequate for emergency fire access. Secondary or additional emergency access has not been required as the FPP recommends a "defend in place" approach in the central portion of

the site. This area is dominated by pasturelands approximately 3000 feet across east to west and more than double this measure north to south.

The FPP also recommends the following measures: 100- to 300-foot fuel management zones with a 400-foot zone around the administration building; 180,000 gallon water storage tank; fire hydrants; trained on-site fire brigade and fire apparatus; staging area for local and state fire services for a base camp during local fires; emergency helipad; building sprinklers. These recommendations are not inclusive of the entire report's content.

The FPP is acceptable with minor revisions per the Rural FPD and County Fire Marshal comments. All mitigation or project design features recommended in the FPP and by the reviewing entities will be conditioned on the project. Therefore, the access is considered acceptable.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Zoning Ordinance Section 6782 Parking Schedule requires provision for on-site parking spaces as specified by the use permit. The project proposes 198 parking spaces. Based the proposed project description, anticipated use type, and maximum student-employee capacity of 360 occupants, the County considers the proposed 198 parking spaces as demonstrating compliance with Zoning Ordinance Section 6682. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in insufficient parking capacity.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project has a current estimate of 90 average daily trips based on a maximum occupancy of 360 people on-site per day. The majority of trips will be generated on Sunday and Friday afternoons when the attendees arrive and depart for the 5-day training courses. Initial trip distribution is estimated at 80% to/from the west along SR 94 and 20% to/from the east. A traffic study shall be

completed to assess potential direct and indirect traffic impacts and safety issues. Traffic issues will also be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH is currently reviewing the project's OSWS but has determined that the project is soils capable of supporting OSWS's. Therefore, the project is anticipated to be consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB as determined by the authorized, local public agency.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: A Stormwater Management Plan and Drainage-Hydrology Study dated November 1, 2006 prepared by Nasland Engineering has been reviewed by the County DPW. Revisions have been requested to both documents. Project development currently proposes construction of site design, source control and treatment control BMPs. One such feature would be detention-retention basins on-site to control peak flow events. The Storm water Management Plan and Drainage-Hydrology Study will provide a detailed analysis. These facilities are not anticipated to result in an adverse physical effect on the environment. Specifically, refer to Sections VI and VIII for more information.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: A Groundwater study will be completed to assess existing groundwater resources, project demand, and potential impacts and mitigation. This issue will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will rely completely on an on-site wastewater system (septic system); therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Studies are being completed to assess potential impacts and mitigation that may degrade the environment, habitat and/or species. This issue will be addressed in the extended studies and Environmental Impact Report.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Each required extended study will individually address cumulative issues. In addition, this issue will be addressed in a comprehensive manner in the Environmental Impact report and CEQA Initial Study.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Studies are being completed to assess potential impacts and mitigation that may affect the human environment. This issue will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).
(<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000
(<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997.
(www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003.
(www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA.
(<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.
(www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System.
(<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.
(www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.
(www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.
(www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991.

American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996.
(www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits.
(www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033.
(www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067.
(www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084.
(www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996.
(ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines.
(<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/>, www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000.
(www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq.
(www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 &13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003.
(www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan.
(www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994.
(www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan,
2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water
Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance,
Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7,
Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory
Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68.
Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined
Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972,
Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-
Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United
States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220,
1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994.
(www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water
Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality
Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997.
(www.sandag.org)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES
Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water
Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin.
(www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and
Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land
Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San
Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines,
2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources
Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations,
Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title
14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001.
(ceres.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51,
California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and
Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title
8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84:
Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989.
(www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land
Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and
amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000.
(ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance,
compilation of Ord. Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631.
1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego
County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by
Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and
Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press
Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq.
1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS
Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS)
Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR,
Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. .
(www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title
3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control,
effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element,
effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation
Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning
(revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and
Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995.
(<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO
1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway
Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise
and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis
and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C.,
June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC
5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter
69--Community Development, United States Congress,
August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13.
(www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and
Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attach.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). (www.sandag.org)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

ND03-07\0620001-ISF